



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 28, 2014 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:

Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Dennis Childress, So Cal Training Officers Association
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers Association (alternate)
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) (alternate)
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters Association (alternate)
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Kenneth Kehmna, Fire District Association of California (via conference call)
Ron Myers, League of California Cities
Kay Price, CAL FIRE Academy (via conference call)
Corey Rose, Metro Chiefs
John Wagner, Nor Cal Training Officers Association
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association
Kim Zagaris, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)

Members Absent:

Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Chris Jelinek, Nor Cal Training Officers
Steve Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South) (alternate)
Jim Skinner, League of California Cities (alternate)
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
Tom Turner, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)

State Fire Training Staff:

Kevin Brame, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kevin Conant, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Jim Eastman, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Mike Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Ron Martin, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Linda Menchaca, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal and SFT Division Chief
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Bill Vandevort, Fire Service Training Specialist III

Guests:

Gil Cody, Merritt College
Sean Gascie, Merritt College
Wellington Jackson, Merritt College
Stan Klopfenstein
Robert Marshall, Contra Costa Fire Department
Tim Palmer, Sierra College
Ed Rogers, FCC Fire Academy
Gordon Moncibais, Fresno City College

I. Introductions and Welcome

Chief Coleman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

Introductions took place. Ken Kehmna and Kay Price were present via conference call. The roll call determined that a quorum was established.

II. Agenda Review

Chief Coleman asked members for modifications to the agenda or if any members needed to exit the meeting. Kim Zagaris stated he will leave the meeting at 9:45, but should return in 30 minutes. Ken Kehmna has an appointment at 10:00 and expects to return at 11:00.

III. Approval of the October 18, 2013 Minutes

Kris Rose stated that due to the short timeframe between the January 17, 2014 and February 28, 2014 meeting, the minutes are still in the revision process. Minutes from the February 28, 2014 meeting and the January 17, 2014 meeting will be available at the April 18, 2014 meeting for approval.

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Chief Richwine provided an update from the last SBFS meeting, which was held on Thursday, February 20, 2014. Items of interest to STEAC was the Fire Fighter I (FFI) certification program. The FF I program was originally approved to run as a beta test through Sierra College, but the certification training standards (CTS) and task book were not present at that meeting for discussion. Therefore, at this meeting, the SBFS approved the CTS and the task book for FF I, and also approved the course plan, CTS, and task book for the FF II certification. The California fire service representatives appointed to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) committee discussed these certification approvals, but not all committees were represented, and it was agreed that the analysis of the committee was that the group was working on curriculum for SFT certification. Additional members have expressed interest, so the action item to follow up on is to round up all California NFPA members and have a conference call to discuss the curriculum, mission

alignment, and training in California so that all are speaking with one voice, that all members are in the loop.

Chief Coleman asked whether the analysis was done of the non-code compliance. Chief Richwine answered that the analysis was done on the professional standards that affected the certification system, but the committee will be conducting the analysis in accordance to the board's action item.

Chief Richwine also added that information on the training classes for the Unified Response to Violent Incidents was presented to the board. The presentation was made and approved to endorse the program for marketing to the fire service. No comments by STEAC members on these updates.

V. Mission Alignment

A. Achieving National Recognition

1. Discussion: Merritt College Accreditation

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 1)**

Rodney Slaughter referred to the staff report to begin the presentation. The site team included Jim Connors and Sam Hoffman as the STEAC representatives. The team conducted a review of Merritt College's facilities in Oakland; conversations took place with the presidents, vice presidents and deans of instruction. The team viewed the physical training facility, and the site team was unanimous in agreeing that Merritt College has the space available to offer the FF I training program that would be of exceptional quality. Merritt College is also reaching out to inner city youths to get them interested in the fire service, and the program will also provide government and life training. Merritt College has the ability to output underrepresented populations that are well- trained back into the system. Present at this discussion were Sean Gascie, Wellington Jackson, and Gil Cody, the representatives from Merritt College, who were available to address any questions about the program.

Motion: Mary Jennings moved to approve the accreditation for Merritt College and Randy Collins seconded the motion.

Action: All members voted unanimously.

Chief Coleman asked the Merritt College representatives to share thoughts about the process and how it relates to SFT. S. Gascie shared his comments about the process and that all is going well, as it took several people, several training officers, and several hours to make this program happen. The contribution is to put forth a formidable academy that makes it available to the youth in our area that want to participate, and to also have the best resources and leadership possible through the city of Oakland, Alameda

County Fire, other neighboring agencies, and continued networking with officials from the state and governmental authorities. S. Gascie ended his comments by saying that Merritt College appreciates the time and effort that SFT has put in.

Chief Coleman asked R. Slaughter how many accredited academies we currently have in our system, and R. Slaughter responded that n there are now 46. Chief Richwine asked about course offerings, what programs will be offered at the Fire Fighter academy, and what is in the course catalog system. Wellington Jackson responded that the ultimate goal is to offer an associate of degree in fire science technology. The college originally offered a couple of classes, but is now offering a complete group of fire service classes that are considered a certificate program. W. Jackson mentioned when R. Slaughter stated that our program would be an extension of SFT, and that we would be able to offer CFSTES and FSTEP classes to our department and region, this process became more was appealing to our school. Chief Coleman asked STEAC members for any additional questions about the presentation.

Applause was given to R. Slaughter, the Merritt College representatives, and other team members for the exceptional work done in working towards the accreditation process.

2. Discussion: Fresno City College Accreditation

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 2)**

Rodney Slaughter discussed the outcome of this accreditation site visit. The site team representatives for the review were Corey Rose for the STEAC membership, Mike Garcia for SFT, and Tim Capehart from Bakersfield College. The recommendation by the site team stated that all the necessary classroom space and equipment was present in order to offer a fire service academy program, as Fresno City College has been a participant with SFT for over 30 years.

Motion: Ken Wagner moved to approve the accreditation for Fresno City College College, and Dennis Childress seconded the motion.

Action: All members voted unanimously.

Gordon Moncibais, the Fire Technology Coordinator for Fresno City College, spoke about the need for the program. For the last two years the officials at Fresno City College have been working to bring the program towards accreditation. G. Moncibais mentioned the city and county agencies that have been working on this program, to include Clovis Fire, CAL Fire – Fresno County, and the City of Clovis. The program currently offers an associate of science degree in fire technology, has some other semester-long fire courses, and now looking to grow and provide improvements to the program. Ed

Rogers from the Fresno City College mentioned that the program was originally created in 1990 by Chief Mike Collins of Fresno City Fire, but there was no interest at the time for a local fire academy. The goal is to also establish the academy in Chief Mike Collins name (now deceased). Bret Davidson spoke about the Fresno Fire Department and the locals in helping with the training officers program. R. Slaughter mentioned that Merritt College and Fresno City College are being evaluated under the old Fire Fighter I curriculum and the current SFT procedures manual. Both colleges have computer labs and other support in order accommodate the accreditation process for the new Fire Fighter I program.

Chief Coleman asked STEAC members for additional comments. Applause was given to R. Slaughter, and the representatives from Fresno City College for an excellent job well done. R. Slaughter also mentioned that the new accreditations for three other colleges are coming in the next 3 weeks, and those colleges are Los Angeles City College on March 18; Sierra College on March 31, and El Camino College, occurring in mid-April. R. Slaughter is looking for participation from the STEAC membership, and mentioned that there are now 47 colleges providing fire training in California. He added that getting individuals trained and ready for the process is very important, as many fire departments are beginning the hiring process for the fire season.

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

1. Discussion: Training and Education System Doctrine

**Presenter: Bill Vandevort
(Attachment 3)**

Bill Vandevort addressed the members and guests about the creation of a Training and Education System Doctrine, which was the result of an internal conversation amongst the SFT staff. There seemed to be questions about the definitions, so a doctrine was created. Reference was made to a recent update to the packet, dated February 28 and identified issues that may need to be discussed for the purpose of creating talking points. The document was originally about defining terms as applied to certification, but will be the underlining premises of how SFT will work. B. Vandevort explained the document in detail, but provided a definition of a doctrine, as used in a training sense. A doctrine precedes vision and mission statements. Chief Coleman added comments about the use of a doctrine in the military, and that the concept can be very broad; nothing new, but new to the fire service.

B. Vandevort continued with presenting the components, which are certification, accreditation, training, education, and professional development. The definitions are being presented for members to review, and if questions arise, to identify them. He then discussed each of the components in detail. These definitions are not specific to fire service, as they are broad terms. The need is for the members to focus on the training and education components, as the components are critical to determine how we craft what is being done in SFT, and to support our constituents in

California, and also gives the participants a framework on how to move forward.

There are separate and distinct components to our training system. B. Vandevort identified the FESHE model (Fire & Emergency Services Higher Education), which is the national model for professional development. All of our organizations need to blend together and make this work. Chief Coleman asked the members for comments on what statements might need to be included, and may have to review a few times before the team gives consensus. Ron Myers was not sure he agreed with all the definitions, but willing to work with them. Randy Collins asked if this document will be presented at a future meeting for approval. B. Vandevort answered that there may be conflicting direction, or blurring of the lines. Chief Richwine thanked B. Vandevort for his work in creating these documents. Bret Davidson asked if these definitions will be used for the Fire Officer and Chief Officer certification tracks. B. Vandevort answered there must be agreement by all members. Chief Coleman mentioned consensus building and that the majority of individuals would go along and vote, because it is good for the interest of the entire group; however, we must continue to build support for these positions. Chief Coleman added that we will continue to edit the document until the team reaches consensus.

2. Discussion: Company Officer Standards and Curriculum

**Presenter: Bill Vandevort
(Attachment 4)**

Bill Vandevort spoke about the proposal to move forward with the new Company Officer curriculum. There were two items that are mandated: incident management training and hazardous materials incident commander training, and that those items are now identified in the certification training standards (CTS).

B. Vandevort continued with making reference to the implementation plan that lists all the course requirements that must be taken prior to becoming certified as a Company Officer. The all-risk incident command operations course is also a pre-requisite before taking the wildland incident operations course. Sam Hoffman suggested that the all-risk command course information be listed at the top of the new course list so that if candidates are interested, they will see that information first. B. Vandevort spoke about the issue of allowing only the classroom version of S-290 and not the online version. The rationale here was that the quality instruction, especially the safety needs, for the S-290 class would not be met with the online version. Dennis Childress asked how instructors would verify the difference between the online and the classroom version of the S-290, because the certificate does not identify which class format was used. Linda Menchaca added that if the class is offered through SFT, the course information is listed on the certificate. D. Childress added that if the class is offered through NWCG, that information is not listed.

Chief Coleman entertained a motion to the membership for continued dialogue on the S-290 class format, which was agreed by B. Vandevort. B. Vandevort called for a motion for the adoption of the curriculum by STEAC membership, with the changes to the CTS.

Motion: Motion made by Bret Davidson for continued discussion and clarification on the S-290 class and the online versus classroom format, and motion seconded by Lorenzo Gigliotti.

Action: All members agreed unanimously.

Chief Coleman stated the presentation is now open for continued discussion and clarification.

Ron Myers asked if we are creating a barrier by not allowing an online version and not having enough instructors, so the company officers will be in a situation where they cannot get access into an S-290 class other than attempting to complete online. It can cause MOU's and compensation problems because the Fire Fighter has a company officer certification. B. Vandevort answered that the issue could end up as an unintended consequence. Chief Richwine added that he has the same concern about a barrier, and that SFT would have to answer the questions and be subject to the criticism, thus the possible need to explain the system. A classroom model for the S-290 is a good delivery model; the online version is only allowed for the Engine Boss qualifications for CICCIS. Pre-requisites are difficult to enforce, when creating for individual classes. Community colleges will need to understand these requirements, ensure that the instructors enforce this policy, and that students be notified in advance. SFT will also accept the responsibility to provide communication in making sure that the policy is addressed.

Randy Collins added comments about updates to Command 1C, which does allow the online S-290 class, and can see where criticism may arise, so effective communication is important. Bret Davidson stated the S-290 class is taught better in a classroom environment with enough instructors and taught in the majority of training facilities and community colleges, and the quality of the course is 100% better. R. Myers commented that he has not seen a large amount of S-290 instructors in the area, in addition to not seeing a large amount of S-290 classes in the Bay Area.

R. Myers asked what is the difference between the online program and the classroom version, and is it better to forward the knowledge to students interested in online, or just have the student not do it at all if not able to get into a classroom version. Corey Rose added that you cannot get the same instruction via a computer versus going out into the wild to learn because you cannot underestimate fire behavior, and S-290 classroom version

teaches that. If the student goes further they would need the classroom version anyway, however there is a value to online training for some courses.

Ken Wagner mentioned that in the CICCIS system and NWCG, the online S-290 is offered to get to the Engine Boss level, but going higher in the system will require the classroom version. R. Myers added that there is a misalignment of the standard, because it is the company officers who are getting into these situations. Chief Coleman asked if this practice is contrary to the streamlining we want to accomplish with Vision 2020, because what is being described is redundancy. B. Davidson disagreed by saying that taking the S-290 can be done for the entire career they do not need the online version. The S-290 class is for some who can act in the position of Engine Boss (which is at the Engineer level, not Captain); we are talking CICCIS versus certification. Kevin Conant added that the federal forestry agencies created the double standard by allowing the online class. It was not the CA agencies advocating the decision or agreeing with it. The cadre members, who were part of the Command 1C re-write and were registered as S-290 instructors, were against the compromise to offer online class—it was pressure for consensus to accept the online course. K. Conant continued by saying that the facilitated discussions that occurred for the instructors who take the students out for field work cannot be replicated online.

K. Wagner stated that as one solution, as we are creating a consequence. In discussion with the fire technology directors, it was suggested that schooling for the classroom version of S-290 be offered now, so when the remainder of the curriculum is approved, students will be ready, having already completed an S-290 classroom version. There would be a need to contact the S-290 instructors to let them know of this change of direction and to offer the classes now to have enough time to build the base of students before the new wildland course is approved by the curriculum committees at the community colleges.

Chief Coleman asked J. Wagner on whether CICCIS is allowing online classes to a certain point, and should we attempt to get everyone on the same page. J. Wagner responded that CICCIS determined that below Strike Team Leader, the online courses would be appropriate.

B. Davidson added the online class may be good enough, but the current class developed by the federal government does not follow the classroom curriculum close enough, nor does it give you the same knowledge, so it is not equivalent to the classroom version; the online course is taken in 6 hours.

Chief Coleman asked the STEAC members on what is the consensus recommendation to move forward to accept or reject the internet-based training. B. Vandevort stated the S-290 classroom version is the allowable pre-requisite for the wildland incident operations course, which we are seeking approval for, and eliminates the use of the online program.

Chief Coleman re-iterated, based on this online discussion, is that the consensus of the STEAC members is the requirement of the classroom version, and that the internet version may be useful for other purposes, perhaps for a CEU or a refresher class, but not for use at this time. R. Collins added there needs to be consistency, especially starting at the lower level training for Fire Fighter. M. Jennings commented that not all subjects are conducive to online individual learning, as some subjects are easily adaptable to that kind of learning. She also added that fact-based training with online testing also work well, but the application phase especially in the fire service environment must contain a classroom element. Mark Romer mentioned there could be confusion between online learning versus a pre-set program; most online programs have a student/instructor interaction process. The S-290 online class identifies videos and the reading of material, with no instructor interaction and is a completely different type of learning.

Chief Coleman asked for additional comments. R. Collins identified that the failure rate is 15% higher in online versus classroom. Chief Coleman re-iterated that by our discussion, we are turning away from the online version, and by doing so are eliminating the possibility of redundancy, but raising awareness that the required classroom version needs to be communicated, although will be listed in the procedures and policy manual. R. Meyers added that for today's purposes, STEAC members agree; however, the concern is upsetting the masses because of not knowing about this change, but it is not the responsibility of STEAC to deal with that possible issue. Some STEAC members sit on other committees, and those individuals may need to be responsible for the communication to their stakeholders.

Chief Coleman asked the team for adoption of the Company Officer training standards guide and all associated documents be moved to the SBFS for approval. Applause was given for B. Vandevort for his hard work.

3. Discussion: Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum **Presenter: Kevin Conant**

Kevin Conant stated that this presentation is information only, with no attachments. A 2nd reading is not being provided today on the Chief Officer

Motion: Motion made by Chief Coleman to adopt the Company Officer Certification Training Standards and all associated documents be moved to the State Board of Fire Services for final approval.

Action: All members voted unanimously.

standards and curriculum due to feedback from the January 17, 2014 STEAC meeting. The standards and curriculum has been divided up and now identified as Chief Fire Officer and Executive Chief Officer. Kevin Brame completed the validation cadre on the Executive Chief Officer this week (February 24-28). K. Conant mentioned that at the attachments from the April 18, 2014 STEAC meeting will be resubmitted and reformatted with the

understanding of the alignment between both certifications. There is a need to identify and scope those courses that are not required by the NFPA and if offered as FSTEP courses, what will it take to create new curriculum. Chief Richwine eventually would need to identify a budget and a task order to have a cadre team created to identify what the constituency would prefer. Chief Coleman asked members for questions, there were none.

4. Discussion: 2013 Plan Examiner Standards and Curriculum **Presenter: Mark Romer** **(Attachment 5)**

Mark Romer discussed the correspondence received as feedback that was received on the Plan Examiner curriculum. M. Romer continued, identifying this presentation as the 2nd reading, and asking for approval of the standards and curriculum.

M. Romer received correspondence from Robert Marshall - Contra Costa Fire Protection District, who was present at this meeting, and Jason Nailon - Apple Valley Fire Protection District, in regards to feedback about the proposed standards and curriculum. M. Romer forwarded the letters to the cadre members for review/discussion. The cadre members were: Rocky Yabola - Central Fire; Mike Menick - Moraga/Orinda Fire Department (retired); Randy Metz - Rio Valley Fire; Gary Dunger - Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development; and Tim Annis, Fire Marshal - Davis Fire Department. M. Romer received the letter from J. Nailon today, February 28.

The cadre's response to M. Romer was that some of the members were not in total agreement with some of the information from R. Marshall's letter, but agreed on a couple of items listed. The first recommendation from the cadre was to create a shorter course, as suggested in R. Marshall's letter, which would meet some of the requirements on fire behavior and inspection principles that were not covered in the curriculum as stated currently in NFPA. The second recommendation is that the cadre team agreed to a clear flow through from Inspector I to Inspector II, and into Plans Examiner; however, NFPA does not recommend or recognize this flow. To get further understanding on the Plans Examiner and the requirements under NFPA, M. Romer explained the various flow processes as shown in the NFPA 1031, and the requirements for various certifications. Plans Examiner I has no pre-requisite requirement of training prior to that, and Plans Examiner II has the requirement of completing Chapter 7 prior to entering into. It was this formatting that the cadre team originally removed. In the standards, an Inspector and Plans Examiner should both have the ability to do plan review. In the Level II Fire Inspector, which incorporates Level II and Level III, it states that an Inspector III should have plan review knowledge. This synopsis identifies where the cadre team stands as of this meeting date. M. Romer stated that he was willing to go back to the cadre team and review this information, but not until the next fiscal year when funding is available. The cadre group will continue to look for direction from the STEAC members.

Chief Coleman asked R. Marshall for an overview of the comments on the letter he wrote about the Plan Examiner curriculum. R. Marshall provided his perspective, saying that the proposed curriculum does not cover what plan reviewers in California are currently tasked with. California fire service personnel typically do plan review and some sections of the building code, where other states are prohibited from doing so. This standards and curriculum does not address that the standard says that a plans examiner is going to review this (sections of the building code). From a practical point of view, there needs to be classes offered by the state specifically for the California building codes and how to use the building codes that are published by the Building Standards Commission because no other agency or organization is offering these classes. The International Code Council (ICC) course can be altered to address the California standards, but a revision would not come from ICC. R. Marshall continued by stating that his other concern is that fire personnel are tasked with reviewing things in other codes, aside from the building codes, and if doing reviews in relation to hazardous materials. R. Marshall concluded his perspective by saying that although the proposed curriculum is a good start, he doesn't believe this is the right solution for what the California fire service may need.

Chief Coleman asked R. Marshall if the ICC has a plan review curriculum. R. Marshall responded that there is curriculum in place, but it doesn't cover all that is covered by the California plan reviewers. Chief Coleman added that the ICC curriculum is general for all 50 states, but California cannot use that curriculum without modification. Chief Coleman asked the STEAC members for comments, but also clarified that this curriculum be tabled until the cadre team has reviewed and re-worked the standards and curriculum. K. Wagner added that curriculum was created to include JPR standards as established by the NFPA standards. He also added that if there were some regulatory requirements, that additional JPR's would be added to the CTS to meet those regulatory provisions, as addressed in the cadres. If in developing the training program to meet the NFPA standard, and identified that there was a determination that other training would be needed for professional qualification, it would not necessarily be required to meet that level of certification because of the intent is to have them aligned to the NFPA standards.

The cadre teams and staff members need to be reminded of our position to be true at the staff level or approval, being aware that some staff may not accept the changes. M. Romer added that instructors should develop their lesson plans to include the specifics of California instruction within the enabling objectives, and to teach that information. R. Marshall asked about whether a future FSTEP class would be developed to teach this subject, and M. Romer answered that if there is a need, then additional training would be developed. Because this curriculum is performance-based, there is a comprehensive task book that goes along with this curriculum in demonstrating this knowledge. Chief Coleman reminded members that there is a motion to accept the curriculum, or take a pause and re-evaluate, and is asking for final comments from members.

Chief Coleman asked M. Romer if there would be a consequence if the curriculum is delayed for 3 months or more, and would it change or alter consequences down the road. M. Romer answered that the consequences of delaying approval could potentially get in the way of the old Prevention 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, and 2C classes that are retiring at the end of 2014, due to the new Fire Inspection series which currently is in place, and already has an implementation plan in place. A new interim policy would have to be re-created for the Inspector I and II series to count towards the current Plans Examiner that currently exists, which are the 3A and 3B classes. M. Romer would need to look at this to identify how the delay would affect certification.

Motion: *Motion made by Chief Coleman to forward the Plan Examiner curriculum to the State Board of Fire Services for adoption and approval.*

Action: *All members voted against.*

Motion: *Motion made by Kim Zagaris to return the Plan Examiner standards and curriculum to the cadre team for discussion and review; Mary Jennings seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

The curriculum and the letters from R. Marshall and J. Nailon will be returned to the cadre team for revision/discussion, and future communication to be made to the SFT office. K. Wagner asked Chief Richwine if the cadre team can continue working on revisions at this time, or wait until the new budget year (July 1) to re-convene the cadre team. Chief Richwine confirmed that they will need to wait until after July 1, 2014 and that the implementation plan would also have to be modified. M. Romer will provide an interim procedure to meet the needs of the current curriculum, utilizing what is already in place, and will provide a recommendation at the July 18, 2014 STEAC meeting.

5. Discussion: Fire Service Instructor I and II Standards and Curriculum
Presenter: Jim Eastman

Jim Eastman stated that the discussion of this curriculum will be moved to the April 18 STEAC meeting, as members will take a motion on Instructor I and II, and review the first reading of Instructor III during that meeting.

6. Trench Rescue Technician
Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 6)

Rodney Slaughter discussed the Trench Rescue Technician presentation that was held at the January 17, 2014 STEAC meeting. This is a program where the services of a professional engineer were secured to identify, help build the shoring system employed in the trench rescue environment, and endorse

the program. The cadre team is asking for a motion to have the curriculum be created as an FSTEP training program. The curriculum is part of a series of courses that were funded by the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES).

Motion: *Motion by Mary Jennings for the approval of curriculum for the Trench Rescue Technician Program to be created as an FSTEP course; Ron Myers seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

Chief Coleman asked Stan Klopfenstein, the cadre lead for the trench rescue program, to speak to the motion. S. Klopfenstein spoke about the development process of creating new curriculum because there was no standard curriculum for the current FSTEP program. The cadre team had written four (4) proofs of the curriculum, and sent these documents to eleven (11) subject matter experts within the fire service across the state that have experience in trench rescue and experience in teaching the subject matter. Positive reviews were received from all of those the subject matter experts, and the proposed curriculum is what is being reviewed at this meeting.

S. Klopfenstein continued this discussion by stating that there was oral history passed down to the curriculum committee from previous instructors, but nothing was in writing. The initial goal was to have engineering-provided support and expertise with using the shoring systems that were going to be taught. The soils engineer that was chosen to work with the curriculum committee holds all the liability for the shoring systems that were designed and created under Option 3 of CAL OSHA, which has four (4) options for building shoring systems. The proposed manual has information that is based on the OSHA data, and certified by the soils engineer. California has the first manual that has been timber shoring, approved by a soils engineer, and specifically designed for trench rescue. Kim Zagaris asked the difference between a soils engineer and a structural engineer, and Chief Coleman answered that the scope and practice would be defined on the scope of the specific engineer. K. Zagaris also added that he has some concerns with the FIREScope/ Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) group or the curriculum committee group who are making recommendations in regards to using 2x8 or 2x12; we need to find a compromise, as there seems to be a disconnect.

Corey Rose commented that there were the various phone calls, e-mails, texts about the usage of using a 2x8 or 2x12; why are we doing this, it is not safe. Chief Richwine stated that perhaps all the members do not have all the information needed. Chief Coleman asked what the real factor is that needs to be resolved.

R. Slaughter mentioned that the USAR task group for FIREScope wrote a letter to its FIREScope operation section denouncing the trench rescue program due to use of the 2x12 lumber. The letter was not addressed to Office of the State Fire Marshal nor to the Chairmen of STEAC. R. Slaughter also stated that there is continued dissension with the USAR/FIREScope group on this issue.

Ron Myers added that there are two issues, and that first issue is that some departments have purchased and have in place the type of shoring that we are looking to change to, based on a preferred versus what it might be, and the second issue is the throwing out the legality of which one is better than the other. Is there some legal liability associated with doing something different, so the question is why we would change from what is being recommended? Chief Richwine asked S. Klopfenstein to provide what is the difference in using the 2x8 versus 2x12.

S. Klopfenstein stated the structure is called an “upright” which is placed on plywood up against the wall of the trench. In order to have the footprint that is needed with the plywood carried on the OES resources, you need the 2x12 against it. Issues were brought up by FIREScope. Some of the concerns from that letter were the size of the lumber, the weight, and the 2x8 timber is currently in the vehicle inventory. The 2x12 recommendation was passed to FIREScope specialist group and accepted the recommendation to change the 2x8 to 2x12, and the re-write is still at the curriculum committee review. K. Zagaris added that these are mutual-aid assets for day-to-day operations, so there should be compromise. Chief Coleman made reference to a letter from Mario Rueda, who states that the requirement is in conflict with the urban search and rescue operational system description (OSD) and requires a maximum size of 2x8. The USAR policies, practices, and procedures say 2x8. K. Zagaris stated that we deal with a minimum not a maximum. Engineering is in place for 2x12, but no engineering exists for the use of 2x8, except that the soils engineer states that a 2X8 is not adequate for trench rescue.

Chief Coleman asked the members how to move forward. R. Myers stated we must get the process right, perhaps sending back for review, if the STEAC membership cannot decide. Dennis Childress commented that the letter does not address the strength between the two timber sizes, so he does not understand why there is arguing about this. K. Zagaris added how we can justify training at one standard, and operate at a lesser standard. Chief Coleman states in this letter that we need to identify how the STEAC team decides to move on this process. S. Klopfenstein stated that the trench rescue community asked SFT for this project in order to have standardized training within the state. The cadre team developed the curriculum with the soils engineer to create these standards to “fight the same way we train”; the new standard has the “wet stamp” of an engineer so we can move forward and do some changes within the structure of the operational system description for the size of lumber we carry, all toward firefighter safety. Chief Coleman asked if the curriculum committee received any information from the American Wood Council in regards to the points on the wood weight. S.

Klopfenstein responded that the committee based its decision on what the engineer suggested.

K. Zagaris added that we are currently reviewing the standard, and are working on addressing issues that will eventually come up. Chief Coleman read from the letter that the use of a 2x8 lumber is the minimum, that the use of a larger 2x12 lumber be optional for agencies to be able to be used, and asked what is wrong with this request. S. Klopfenstein responded that we do not have the data for 2x8, but have the data to support the 2x12, which is what the soils engineer approved.

R. Slaughter added that the project has been plagued with finance/grant issues, budget shut downs, and contract issues, but have moved through to get the product completed. The USAR task group is entrenched and will not move forward, but R. Slaughter has advised the curriculum committee to move forward with the recommendation of the soils engineer. R. Myers asked K. Zagaris if the STEAC members took a motion to adopt, what would happen with FIREScope, and will they take action contrary on what we do. K. Zagaris responded that we have a training and operational issue that needs to be resolved, but need to identify the best training for the staff who have to provide trench rescue. Chief Coleman asked members about the strength of the 2x8 versus a 2x12 depending on the stress being generated; the response was that this issue has been addressed by the soils engineer with all facts regarding the lateral strength of the 2x8, laid flat against the plywood against the wall. Chief Richwine provided his comments on who is going to pay to find another engineer, and has expressed his frustration on the discussed letter related to the specific vote. Chief Richwine believes we are not going to come to a resolution at this time, because USAR has already made a decision.

Bret Davidson stated that this is a safety issue, as there's a need for engineering to be involved. STEAC should delay this approval until FIREScope identifies an engineer, meet with the soils engineer, and then meet the next three months in an attempt to resolve. Chief Coleman suggested going to the Wood Council to ask for more information on the product, and to provide scientific information on the stress points and the load path.

Motion: *Motion made by Chief Coleman to accept the Trench Rescue curriculum for adoption and approval.*

Action: *All members present voted against.*

Motion: *Motion moved by Ron Myers for the Trench Rescue cadre team and other interested parties to review the curriculum; Corey Rose seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members present voted unanimously.*

M. Jennings asked whether we should request scientific validation on the proposal, and whether the other process would work and that it would be the only reason she would change her vote. R. Myers offered the motion to not have conflict between two groups. Sam Hoffman agreed with M. Jennings, adding that all soil is not the same; what is found in a trench is not what is found on a sunny day. Chief Richwine stated that SFT asked a vendor to publish the manual, and the vendor is awaiting an approval, as there are roll-outs sessions to schedule. S. Klopfenstein provided a copy of the Trench Rescue Technician manual to Chief Coleman to view. B. Davidson believes that FIREScope should come back to STEAC and identify that an engineer has determined that the 2x8 is safe. Chief Coleman stated that this is an inter-agency issue, an operational issue, a training issue, and STEAC is to develop a strategy to come out with a solution that everyone can support. If the motion is passed, STEAC will need to sit down and have some dialogue on what is the best answer for all involved.

R. Myers re-stated the motion for STEAC to not take action and send curriculum back to all parties, and for the USAR task group to provide scientific data on why a 2x8 should be used, opposed to a 2x12. K. Zagaris and Chief Richwine will get together to discuss, once the scientific data has been obtained. Mike Garcia added that the opinion in his area is that groups are not accepting. Kevin Brame asked if OSHA was consulted, because OSHA specifically addresses shoring requirements on the federal level. R. Slaughter answered that Patrick Bell from OSHA has reviewed the course materials and the engineer's data.

Motion: *Motion made by Chief Coleman for the Trench Rescue cadre team and the Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) task group to review the curriculum, and for the USAR task group to provide scientific data on why a 2x8 should be used, opposed to a 2x12, and to report out at the STEAC April 18.*

Action: *10 members approved the motion.*

7. National Fire Academy (NFA) 2015 Course Call

**Presenter: Mike Garcia
(Attachment 7)**

Mike Garcia provided an update in regards to the course call. Typically there are 9 courses offered per year for northern California and southern California, and are in the middle of the 2014 program. Some agencies have not been meeting the NFA deadlines, leading to some cancellations. Out of the nine (9) courses, 3 additional classes are 6- 10 day format, and will be going out to the jurisdictions to identify interested parties wanting to host NFA classes. NFA has a 30-40 day cycle where they need a roster for the 2-day courses to be turned in by, or actual applications that have to go to SFT for the 6 and 10-day courses. Need to identify a better tickler system so these applications are turned in to the NFA in a timely manner. M. Garcia will be sending out to the existing agencies to notify these groups that the course

catalog is now available. Correspondence was received from the US Marine Corps in San Diego to work with San Diego City in offering classes. City of Los Angeles has a 6-day course coming up in the next 6 weeks, and still working with R. Slaughter to identify which agencies in Northern CA might be interested. When classes are given, are well-received and well attended, would like to offer more but FEMA can only hold nine (9) as of this time.

M. Garcia asked the membership for question. Kevin Brame commented about his and M. Garcia's participation as trade co-chairs for Region 9 (CA, AZ, NV, HI) and that states gets their 9 courses. Have had dialogue to create a fire school, and each state would be willing to donate 1-2 classes, and on a weekend to offer multiple courses. With the call in place, CA we should push the agenda and offer up two courses along with AZ and NV. If generated this weekend approach this may be a momentum to get the classes filled. M. Garcia asked if individuals have interest to contact him directly, and has heard from CA Fire & Rescue Training, and will discuss with L. Gigliotti.

8. CFFJAC Unified Response to Violent Incidents

Presenter: Mary Jennings

Mary Jennings spoke on behalf of Taral Brideau, who was attending a legislative hearing in Los Angeles. An informational brochure was passed around to members, which identifies the content covered. There is a lot of interest due to the Active Shooter portion. There will be a train-the-trainer course, but it will not include specific policies for response as that will be left to the local jurisdictions. Material from FEMA, Homeland Security and FIRESCOPE will be covered. It will have a skills station for EMS and rescue task forces. Both law enforcement and fire service personnel will be attending, and many are anxious to train together.

There is a need to have more conversations about offering more courses, and provide more service to the public, as there are waiting lists on many of the courses. Courses will begin in April, and are being offered under a grant from OES. Attendees will be given a flash drive with an instructor outline, student materials and presentational material, in addition to video training that will involve both law enforcement and fire service. M. Jennings opened the floor for questions. Dennis Childress talked about 30% of law enforcement attendance and 140 participants that attended at a recent training. There is an advisory committee, with 6 individuals providing the training. S. Hoffman mentioned a similar class he attended a couple of years ago.

C. Cross Generational Marketing No Report

VI. Announcements/Correspondence

Chief Richwine read an e-mail from Leslie Muller as she forwarded her contact information and is looking forward to working with SFT in developing standards for

dispatchers. A copy will be forwarded to the members, and will be included in the minutes.

Recognition was provided to Bill Vandevort, as he is retiring from working as the cadre lead for all the SFT projects. Applause was given to Bill and all the work he was done.

Chief Coleman made reference to a rebuttal letter from Stan Klopfenstein about the FIREScope issue. This letter will be included with the STEAC files for today's meeting. Chief Richwine suggested that the letter be retained as restricted.

VII. Roundtable
No Report

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

A. April 18, 2014; July 18, 2014; October 17, 2014

There will be a closed session from 9:00 – 10:00 at the April 18, 2014 STEAC meeting in order to hold an appeal for reinstatement of instructor registration. The STEAC meeting will begin at 10:00 am in the SFT Conference Room, and will be open for guests.

IX. Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm.